

PATENT

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a non-final Office action dated June 3, 2004. Claims 1-30 were examined. A non-narrowing amendment has been made to claim 29, and has not been made to overcome any art of record. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 29 has been amended for clarity.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), second paragraph

Claims 1 – 15, 19, and 21 – 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,323, naming Shulman et al. as inventors (hereinafter *Shulman*). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

Shulman at least fails to disclose or suggest different lexical contexts and any transition, much less a transition from behavior in accordance with a first lexical context to behavior in accordance with a second lexical context. The Office Action simply refers to its rejection of claim 1 to support rejection of claims 2 – 15, 19, and 21 – 30. The Office Action does not address the particular limitations claims other than claim 1.

Assist Window is not a Lexical Context

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action relies upon *Shulman's* Abstract and Figure 4. *Shulman's* Abstract and Figure 4 cannot support a rejection of Applicant's claims, nor can any other section of *Shulman*. *Shulman* discloses automatically displaying an assist window (i.e., a pop-up window), which displays two general categories of information (Abstract), and Figure 4 illustrates a pop-up window displaying selections for completing a member name. The pop-up window is not a lexical context. The pop-up window does not affect behavior in accordance with a set of lexical rules. The pop-up window provides a user with a selection of choices "to complete an immediate section of a programming language statement" (col. 7, lines 30 – 33). "Choosing from the finite list of menu items also saves the programmer from having to manually

PATENT

enter each keystroke of an immediate section of a programming language statement and minimizes the chances that the programmer might inadvertently enter a typographical error into a programming language statement" (col. 7, lines 34 – 39). Again, the assist window of *Shulman* is not a lexical context.

Activation of Pop-up Window is not Transition of Behavior in accordance with a First Lexical Context to Behavior in accordance with a Second Lexical Context

The activation of the assist window in *Shulman* does not transition behavior from being in accordance with a first lexical context to being in accordance with a second lexical context. In fact, in addition to the assist window not being a lexical context, the assist window is "non-intrusive to programmer input and can be ignored by the programmer" (Abstract). Applicant does not assert that the transition in behavior as recited in the claims is intrusive, but that the assist window disclosed by *Shulman* essentially has no effect without user interaction, thus there is not transition in behavior in *Shulman*.

Although not addressed by the Office Action, Applicant indicates at least some of the additional subject matter in the independent claims not disclosed or suggested by *Shulman* or any other art of record:

Claim 7:

An interactive software engineering tool that, in response to introduction of a language-defined opening boundary token at a cursor position in an edit buffer, automatically inserts a corresponding closing boundary token, such that display of edit buffer content past the cursor position maintains its pre-introduction association with a first lexical context and with linguistically-driven typography therefor, while subsequent entry at the cursor position is subject to a second lexical context.

Claim 12:

A method of operating an interactive software engineering tool, the method comprising:

PATENT

rendering a display presentation corresponding to a unit of source code, said display presentation corresponding to at least a first lexical context operative at an insertion point; recognizing interactive entry of an opening boundary token at the insertion point; and in response to said recognition of said opening boundary token, creating a second lexical context operative for subsequent interactive entry at the insertion point, wherein the second lexical context is delimited by said opening boundary token and a position in the source code immediately following the insertion point, wherein said opening boundary token is a valid lexical token in accordance with one of the first and the second lexical context and not a non-lexical, structural command to the interactive software engineering tool.

Claim 25:

A computer program product encoded in at least one computer readable medium and comprising:
functionally-descriptive encodings of at least first and second language contexts; and
instructions at least partially implementing a source code editor that invokes the second language context nested within the first language context based solely on recognition of a boundary token defined by the first language context and entered at the cursor position, while maintaining pre-existing language context past the cursor position.

Claim 30:

A computer system comprising:
a display;
memory;
a language-based editor program executable thereby; and

PATENT

a buffer defined by the source code editor program and instantiable in the memory,
wherein the language-based editor program renders contents of the buffer to the display in accordance with an associated language context, and
wherein the language-based editor program recognizes entry of a transitional opening token defined by a first language context and, in response thereto, associates text subsequently entered into the buffer at an insertion point thereof with a second language context, while maintaining a pre-existing association between the first language context and contents of the buffer past the insertion point.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 – 15, 19, and 21 – 30 are allowable and that none of the claims are anticipated by *Shulman*, or any other art or record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 16 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of *Shulman*. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of *Shulman* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,583,762, naming Shafer as an inventor. Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections. Applicant submits that at least for the reasons given above, claims 16 – 18 and 20 are not obvious in view of *Shulman*, at least because *Shulman* does not anticipate their corresponding base independent claim 12.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16 – 18 and 20 are allowable and that none of the claims are anticipated by *Shulman*, or any other art or record.

Conclusion

In summary, claims 1-30 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if

PATENT

any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
 facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.

Steven R. Gilliam

Sep-3-2004

Date

Respectfully submitted,

Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6320
(512) 338-6301 (fax)

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____